IN THE DISTRICT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

ADELAIDA ANDERSON and JEFF ANDERSON,

Plaintiffs,

٧.

Case No. 19-cv-800-SPM

RAYMOND CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Transcript of Jury Trial - Volume I November 1, 2021

Proceedings held in person before the Honorable **STEPHEN P. McGLYNN**, United States District Judge Presiding

East Saint Louis, Illinois

REPORTED BY:

HANNAH JAGLER, RMR, CRR, FCRR

Official Court Reporter 750 Missouri Avenue

East Saint Louis, Illinois 62201

618-482-9481

Hannah_Jagler@ilsd.uscourts.gov

Following proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

APPEARANCES:

FOR PLAINTIFF: MICHAEL J. WARSHAUER

JASPER V. ABBOTT

Warshauer Law Group, PC 2740 Bert Adams Road Atlanta, Georgia 30339

404-892-4900

Mwarshauer@warlawgroup.com Jasper@warlawgroup.com

FRANK J. McCOY, JR.

McCoy & McCoy, LLC

20 Church Street, Suite 1720 Hartford, Connecticut 06103

860-244-9100

Frank@mccoymccoy.com

RYAN E. BRENNAN

Brennan Law Firm PC 19 Bronze Pointe

Belleville, Illinois 62226

618-236-2121 Ryan@feladlc.com

FOR DEFENDANT: FRANCIS H. LoCOCO

Husch Blackwell LLP

555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202

414-978-5305

Frank.lococo@huschblackwell.com

G. PATRICK MURPHY

Murphy & Murphy, LLC

3415 Office Park Drive, Suite D

Marion, Illinois 62959

618-248-3236

Gpatrick@murphymurphyllc.com

MARGARET KATHRYN HEITKAMP

Husch Blackwell LLP

511 North Broadway, Suite 1100

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202

414-978-5373

Margaret.Heitkamp@huschblackwell.com

1	<u>INDEX</u>
2	PAGE
3	
4	Opening Instructions10
5	Opening Statement By Mr. Warshauer
6	Opening Statement By Mr. LoCoco
7	
8	
9	INDEX OF EXHIBITS
10	NO. DESCRIPTION ID'D RCV'D
11	None
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 1 (Proceedings commenced at 9:12 a.m.) 2 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: US District Court for the 3 Southern District of Illinois is now in session, the Honorable 4 Stephen McGlynn presiding. You may be seated. 5 Calls Case Number 19-cv-800, Adelaide Anderson, 6 7 et al., v. Raymond Corporation. Calls case for first day of 8 trial. Parties, if you would please state your name for the 9 record. MR. WARSHAUER: Good morning. Michael Warshauer 10 11 for the plaintiff. 12 MR. McCOY: Good morning, Your Honor. Frank McCoy for the plaintiff. 13 MR. BRENNAN: Good morning, Your Honor. 14 Ryan Brennan for the plaintiff. 15 MR. ABBOTT: Good morning. Jasper Abbott for the 16 plaintiffs. 17 18 MR. LoCOCO: Good morning, Your Honor. Frank 19 LoCoco for Raymond. 20 MR. MURPHY: Good morning, Judge. Patrick Murphy for Raymond, Defendant. 21 22 MS. HEITKAMP: Good morning, Your Honor. Margaret Heitkamp for the defendant Raymond Corporation. 23 THE COURT: All right. Are Plaintiffs ready for 24 25 trial?

MR. WARSHAUER: 1 We are. THE COURT: Defendants ready for trial? 2 3 MR. LoCOCO: Yes. Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Is there anything -- is 4 there anything we need to take up before we bring in the 5 prospective jurors, from the plaintiff's perspective? 6 7 MR. WARSHAUER: No, sir. 8 MR. LoCOCO: No, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: All right. Bring in the jurors. 10 (Voir dire.) 11 THE COURT: Okay. Let's talk about opening Counsel, how long -- how long do you wish to speak? 12 statements. How long do you think your opening will be? 13 MR. WARSHAUER: I think it's under 25 minutes. 14 15 but I suspect by the time I screw it up, it will be 32 or 3. THE COURT: 16 That's fine. MR. LoCOCO: Mine is about 45, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right. So if -- I've got to read 18 19 the opening instructions. By the time we sit them down, it's 20 What I will probably do is because it's after lunch, 21 we'll break right after your opening, all right? And then come 22 back for your opening, and then that puts us -- we can at least get one witness in, don't you think? 23 24 MR. WARSHAUER: I think we have one short one. 25 MR. LoCOCO: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. 1 2 MR. LoCOCO: And the other thing to tell you -we talked about this Friday, but we've since done it. 3 Mr. Warshauer showed me what he's using in opening statement on 4 the screen and I showed him what I'm using, and I think we're 5 good to go. 6 7 And I've objected to what he's MR. WARSHAUER: 8 using, but, you know, here's my thought about opening. If 9 somebody shows something that never comes in, that's their risk. 10 I mean, that's just sort of my thought. I'm going to try to keep it out when they offer it at trial, but right now he thinks 11 it's going to come in. He can show it. It's not horrifically 12 horrible blood-and-guts prejudicial, "no one can ever unsee it." 13 MR. LoCOCO: I think we'll get it in, Your Honor. 14 I'm confident. 15 16 MR. WARSHAUER: So, Your Honor, I'm just not a big objector to things like that. 17 THE COURT: So you are not waiving your objection 18 19 to --20 MR. WARSHAUER: Absolutely not --21 THE COURT: -- that piece of demonstrative 22 A photo? What are we talking about? evidence? It's a couple of -- well, I don't 23 MR. LoCOCO: 24 know exactly. 25 THE COURT: Slides?

MR. WARSHAUER: Well, one is the -- as the Court 1 knows, we're objecting to anything that has to do with the door. 2 3 That's the off-dock videos he plans to show. And the other thing that we objected to was Mike Rogers driving a forklift, 4 that we don't think that is similar, but, you know, it's a 5 demonstration. He can show it. If it never came in at all, he 6 7 can show this is the path they took. I mean, you know --8 THE COURT: Well, so for the record, you do not 9 have to voice your objection during his presentation. You're 10 preserving your objections as to the admissibility of documents 11 or demonstrative evidence that he touches on in opening. Right? MR. LoCOCO: So it's those three videos. Any of 12 13 the paper stuff, photographs? Most of the photographs we 14 MR. WARSHAUER: 15 jointly agree to. MR. LoCOCO: 16 Right. Okay. Thank you. 17 THE COURT: All right. Let's bring the jurors in. 18 19 MR. WARSHAUER: Your Honor, could --20 THE COURT: Before -- anything else? 21 MR. WARSHAUER: While they're panning in, I'm 22 going to go wash my hands real quick. THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: That's fine. It takes a 23 24 few minutes for them to come up. 25 THE COURT: Let's give them -- we'll plan on

giving them five minutes to come up.

CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK: They're on their way up right now, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We'll give them five minutes anyway.

I'll build the suspense.

(Recess from 1:14 p.m. to 1:19 p.m.)

(Jury panel enters at 1:19 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Be seated, everyone.

All right. We are on the record in the matter of Anderson v. Raymond Corporation. Ladies and gentlemen, we have selected the jury. For those of you who are not selected, you are to report to -- when you leave here, report to the jury assembly room. I don't know if any other judges in this courthouse have trials that are going on. If so, there's a chance that you could be asked to -- or invited to be part of another jury trial this week. They'll have a better idea downstairs.

But for those who are not selected, I want to tell you that I appreciate very much your willingness to show up and go through the process. And I hope just by going through this process, I hope it reaffirms some of the appreciation that you have for the quality of our justice system. We are very dependent on good citizens like yourself showing up and being available to serve on a jury even if ultimately you're not picked.

In civil jury trials in the federal court, we only have six jurors and two alternates, so we have way more potential jurors here than we needed. If you didn't get picked, it wasn't because we didn't think that you weren't a good citizen. Frankly, we didn't get that far down the list before we had picked all of our jurors. So again, thank you, and report downstairs.

With that, Juror Number 1 will be _____.

If you'll come up and have a seat down here, _____. Juror Number 2 is _____.

Juror Number 3 is _____.

Juror Number 4 will be ______. Juror Number 5 will be _____. Alternate

Number 1 will be _____. And Alternate Number 2 will be _____.

Come take your seats.

All right. And just a note, ladies and gentlemen, what we will do after you check into the jury assembly room, most likely they'll tell you that you can leave for the day. This case is open to the public. If you're sufficiently intrigued about the case and you want to come back and sit in on opening statements we will have a little later today, you're welcome to sit in the back.

With that, thank you. You're free to go to the jury assembly room.

(Struck jurors exit.)

THE COURT: All right. Everybody be seated.

All right. We will now swear in the jury panel.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Jurors, if you would

please raise your right hand.

(Jury sworn.)

THE COURT: Thank you.

Members of the jury, we are about to begin the trial of this case. And you've heard some details during the jury selection. But before the trial begins, there are certain instructions you should have in order to better understand what would be presented before you and how you should conduct yourself during the trial.

The party who brings a lawsuit is called a plaintiff in this action. It's the plaintiffs, Adelaida Anderson and her husband Jeff, who claim they suffered serious injury when Adelaida was operating a lift truck.

The party against whom the suit is brought is called a defendant. In this action, the defendant is Raymond Corporation because they manufactured the lift truck in question.

The plaintiff alleges a count in strict liability, products liability, alleging that the lift truck was defective or unreasonably dangerous as designed. The defendant denies the allegations against it.

To succeed on the claims, the plaintiffs must prove their claims by a preponderance of the evidence. When I

say a particular party must prove something by a preponderance of the evidence, that is -- this is what I mean. When you have considered all the evidence in the case, you must be persuaded that it is more probably true than not true.

By your verdict, you will decide disputed issues of fact. I will decide all questions of law that arise during the trial. And before you retire to deliberate, at the close of this case, I will instruct you on the law that you must follow and apply in deciding your verdict.

Since you will be called upon to decide the facts in the case, you should give careful attention to the testimony and the evidence presented for your consideration, bearing in mind that I will instruct you at the end of the trial concerning the manner in which you should determine the credibility or believability of each witness and the weight to be given to his or her testimony.

During the trial, however, you should keep an open mind and should not form or express any opinion about the case one way or the other until you've heard all the evidence and testimony, the closing arguments of the parties, and my instructions to you on the applicable law.

While the trial is in progress, you must not discuss the case in any manner among yourselves or with anyone else nor should you permit anyone to discuss it in your presence.

During the trial, I may be called upon to make rulings of law on objections or motions made by the lawyers. It is the duty of the attorney of each side of a case to object when the other side offers testimony or other evidence which that attorney believes is not properly admissible.

You should not show prejudice against an attorney or his or her client because the attorney's made objections. You should not infer or conclude from any ruling or other comment that I may make that I have an opinion on the merits of this case, favoring one side or the other. And if I should sustain an objection to a question that goes unanswered by the witness, you should not draw any inference or conclusions from the question itself.

During the trial, I may confer with the lawyers out of your hearing with regard to questions of law or procedure that may require a consideration by the Court alone. On some occasions, you'll be excused from the courtroom for the same reason. I'll try to limit these interruptions, but you should remember the importance of the matter you are here to determine and should be patient, even though the case may seem to be going slowly.

The case will proceed in the following order:

First, the plaintiffs make an opening statement outlining their case. The defendant will make an opening statement, outlining its case. Neither side is required to make an opening

statement. What is said in opening statement is not evidence, but is simply designed to provide you with an introduction as to the evidence which the party making the statement intends to produce or to prove.

Second, the plaintiff will introduce evidence in support of her claims. At the conclusion of Plaintiff's case, the defendant may introduce evidence. They're not obliged to introduce evidence, but they may introduce evidence. Then the plaintiffs are allowed to offer what's known as rebuttal evidence at the close of Defendant's case. They may be able to offer evidence to rebut evidence that was presented by the defendant.

Third, I will instruct you on the law which you are to apply in reaching your verdict.

Fourth, the parties present closing arguments to you as to what they consider that the evidence has shown and as to the inference which they contend you should draw from the evidence.

What is said in closing argument, just as what is said in opening statement, is not evidence. The arguments are designed to present you -- to you the contentions of the parties based on the evidence introduced. The plaintiff has the right to start opening statement -- or the closing argument and they get rebuttal. So the plaintiff will get to make a closing statement, then the defendant, and if the plaintiff wishes, can

rebut arguments made by the defendant.

The evidence in the case will consist of sworn testimony of witnesses, regardless of who may have called them, and all exhibits received into evidence, regardless who may have produced them, and all the facts which may have been judicially noticed and which I'll instruct you to take as true for the purposes of this case.

Statements and arguments of Counsel are not evidence in the case. Any evidence as to which objection is sustained by the Court and any evidence ordered stricken by the Court must be entirely disregarded by you.

Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be entirely disregarded. In that regard, you should not seek out any information about this case, the parties, or the attorneys from others or via the internet. You're to consider only the evidence in the case.

But in your consideration of the evidence, you are not limited to the bald statements of a witness. In other words, you are not limited solely to what you see or hear as the witness testifies. You are permitted to draw from the facts which you find have been proven such reasonable inferences as you feel are justified in light of experience.

At the end of the trial, you will have to make your decision based upon what you recall is evidence. You will not have a written transcript to consult, and it is difficult

and time-consuming for the reporter to read back lengthy testimony. So I urge you to pay close attention as the testimony is being given.

After the evidence has been heard and arguments and instructions are concluded, you will retire to consider your verdict. You will determine the facts of all the testimony that you hear and other evidence that is submitted. You are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts, and in that field, neither I nor anyone else may invade your province. On the other hand, and with equal emphasis, I instruct you that you are bound to accept the rules of law that I give you, whether you agree with them or not.

Now the law in the United States permits the judge to comment on the evidence in the case during trial or in instructing the jury. Such comments are only expression of the judge's opinions as to the fact and the jury may disregard them in its entirety, since you are the sole judges of the facts.

During the trial, I will permit you to take notes, but under caution and order. There is always a tendency to attach undue importance to matters in which one has written down. Some testimony which is considered unimportant at the time presented and thus not written down takes on a greater importance later in the trial in light of all the evidence presented. So keep in mind that your notes are only a tool to aid your own individual memory, and you should not compare your

notes with other jurors in determining the content of any testimony or in evaluating the importance of the evidence. Your notes are not evidence and by no means a complete outline of the proceedings or a list of the highlights of the trial. Above all, your memory is your greatest asset when it comes time to deliberate and render a decision in a case.

I remember the first case I tried as a judge. It was a bench trial. And I was certain that the case was going to go a particular direction. And the outcome of the case changed the very last question asked of the very last witness. And so I learned a very important -- a very important lesson there. You need to keep an open mind throughout the process.

The other thing is, you'll get an instruction on circumstantial evidence. Some people think, "Can we rely on circumstantial evidence?" Yes. You can draw reasonable inferences from things that would constitute circumstantial evidence.

So with that, I'm going to turn this over now to the lawyers.

Counsel, did you have something?

MR. LoCOCO: Your Honor, can we just see sidebar briefly? We don't have to be on the record.

THE COURT: All right.

(Discussion off the record.)

THE COURT: If there are -- Counsel reminded me

that typically during trials, witnesses are excluded from watching the trial. So if there are anyone in the courtroom that anticipates being a witness who is not a party or not the son of the parties, that person should leave. I have granted a motion to exclude witnesses.

All right. With that, Mr. Warshauer, you may proceed.

MR. WARSHAUER: May it please the Court, Counsel, Anderson family.

It's taken a long time to get here, hundreds of hours of work, but at the end of the day, while it's a big case and an important case, it's a simple case. And I hope not to take too much of your time this morning, or this afternoon to share that with you.

Let me start with this thought: All talk and no action. It's how we judge people, and I think it's fair to judge corporations that same way. This is a case about a forklift that kept moving after its driver was no longer in the operator position, then that forklift ran over its own operator and the unguarded wheel on the back of it crushed and tore the flesh off her foot.

The Raymond Corporation designed the forklift.

Its design choices are why we're here. Let's talk a little bit about these forklifts. We see the forklift here. And we'll see a man come up in a moment, and he's going to get on the

forklift, and you'll see he puts two feet -- and the camera will zoom in on the two feet. I'm going to start the video in a second. You'll see the two feet, and then you'll see his hands. One hand draws the tiller -- and I'll tell you about this -- and the other's on this thing called a multifunction. You go forwards towards the forks, it goes towards the forks. You go this way towards the door, it goes towards the door. There's something called plugging. If you're going this way and you want to stop, you just pull it the other way. That's the most common way to stop it.

So this operator position that we're going to see in this very short video clip is two feet on the floor, back against the backrest, left hand here, right hand here. Okay?

(Video played.)

MR. WARSHAUER: Those are the two feet on the floor that I mentioned. That's a critical part of the operator position, hands on the controls. Now when you want to go towards the forks -- we'll see that he drives it -- that would be towards the forks, then you'll see it stop in neutral, then comes back. So what he's done is pushed forward, pull it back, and if he keeps pulling it back, it comes towards us.

This idea that we see him coming towards us with the forks trailing is the way that they normally drive in warehouses, and there's a reason for that. You don't want your forks to run where they could poke people or poke things, and

you have the best view because you're not looking through the mast. There's a downside. The open doorway is right there, and your left foot is very near it.

So here we see a young woman on this forklift.

We see her two feet on the floor, her back against the backrest, the left hand on the steering tiller, and the right hand, we could see if she wasn't in the way, is over on the multifunction. But I want to point out one other feature that we're going to be talking about, and that's this unguarded rear wheel.

These forklifts, as I told you in voir dire, are most often used in large warehouses. Narrow aisles, lots of things to bump into. They pick things up, they carry them, and then they put them down. Let's keep in mind that that's all they're supposed to do. Pick things up, carry them, and put them down. That's it.

When these nearly 9,000-pound hard-tired -- they don't have inflated tires. They're hard rubber tires. When they go even over relatively minor cracks, it can be pretty jarring to the operator. Manufacturers try to fix this with these cushion-ride floors, but at the end of the day, you can only do so much. Even on the smoothest riding forklift, they're jarring when they go over cracks. It's particularly true as forklifts get older, just as old cars with bad shocks go over speed bumps a little differently than new cars do.

A critical safety part that should exist in all of these forklifts, and this is something we're really going to be focusing on over the next several days, is that it should stop moving if the operator leaves the operator position.

Doesn't matter why they leave the operator position. The forklift should not keep moving. So if they fall out or are thrown out because they hit an impediment, if they're swatting at a bee, if they pass out from heat exhaustion, the forklift needs to stop to protect them from injury.

Now if it doesn't, it can run the operator over. Now we know that's important for the forklift to stop moving first because it just makes common sense. And, folks, one of the things I hope that you brought into this building and into that box is your common sense, because it's a really valuable tool in a case like this, and I'm going to rely on it as we present our case.

But there's a second reason, other than our common sense, that forklifts shouldn't keep moving when we're not on them, and that's that there are international and national safety standards. These standards require this, they mandate it, that the forklift not keep moving when the operator's no longer in it. The US forklift safety standard that governs forklifts, we're going to talk about it, it's called the ANSI B56.1 Standard, American National Standards Institute, B56.1 Standard.

The Raymond Corporation will say that its products must comply with this standard to be safe, but compliance requires design features, not just words. So here's part of the standard. Means shall be provided -- "shall be provided" means it's mandatory, not maybe, but shall be provided -- to disconnect the travel circuit automatically when the operator leaves the operator position.

So the operator position is two feet on the floor, back against the backrest, hand on the tiller, hand on the multifunction. Virtually every manufacturer that sells sidestance forklifts complies with this standard by having a deadman pedal under the operator's left foot, the one that's closest to the door, the one that might fall out if something goes south. They have that operator pedal there, that deadman pedal there so that the emergency brakes will apply. If safety is going to be first, the first thing a forklift needs to do is stop moving when the driver is not in the operator position.

Every other major manufacturer in the world handles this with two pedals. Every other major manufacturer, when your left foot leaves the floor, the deadman pedal applies the emergency brake. But even without this safety standard and even without the entire industry leading the way, as I said, it just makes common sense. Just makes common sense that a forklift should not move if the operator is not safely in the operator compartment.

So let's return back to the Raymond forklift.

Now we're looking down into the body of the forklift. We see that there's a pedal there, and that's the deadman pedal. As you operate the Raymond forklift, the two feet on the floor, the forks to your right, the most natural place for that foot pedal to be is under your right foot. And the vast majority of operators do it that way. There may be some people who somehow figured out a way to stand in a weird way, but most people stand with their right foot on that pedal. You hold that pedal down. It's quite easy to hold down. And you let the pedal up to apply the emergency brake.

And so if you were to be in the forklift and you needed to stop it the very fastest way, you come up on your right foot. Okay? But if you fell out, the emergency brake would not apply until your right foot leaves it. Also keep in mind, that if your hands are on the controls, as you fall to your left and your right foot is still on the brake, while you're trying to pull yourself back in, you're pulling towards the door, meaning you're making things worse.

MR. MURPHY: Judge?

THE COURT: One moment.

MR. LoCOCO: Is this a witness?

THE COURT: Mr. Warshauer, is this your witness

in the courtroom?

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Is she one of the jurors?

MR. WARSHAUER: No.

MR. LoCOCO: I'm sorry. Thank you.

THE COURT: And, folks, if you don't want to wear your mask, you don't have to wear your mask.

MR. WARSHAUER: So there's just one pedal. It's nothing under the left foot.

So what I want to show you next is how other manufacturers do it. So on the left, we see Crown. Crown has about 50 percent of the market for this kind of forklift, this -- what's called a counterbalance lift. They're used to load trucks. They're the workhorse of warehouses, a multipurpose lift. Crown invented it in 1972. They've had two pedals, one under the right foot, which is the sensor, and under the left foot is a deadman pedal, can be operated with the heel, middle of your foot, anywhere you want, depending on how you stand in the forklift.

If the left foot leaves the operator compartment on the Crown and these other brands that I shared with you, the forklift stops as fast as it's able to stop safely. Now that's the way the majority of the industry complies with that B56.1 7.20.2 Standard I showed you.

So now let's see what happens on the Raymond.

Right foot's holding down the single deadman pedal. There's nothing under the left. When the left foot leaves, the forklift keeps moving. The Raymond Corporation is alone in choosing to

have nothing under the operator's left foot. It's alone in having a design that allows its forklift to keep moving even when the operator has fallen out.

Our focus over the next several days together is going to be on two of Raymond's design choices. First choice: The forklift keeps moving when the operator's out of it. We've got to decide if that's a good choice. The second choice: There's no guard over the wheel. Okay, folks. So this brings us to your job. You need to decide if either or both of the Raymond Corporation's design choices -- if its design decisions make the forklift unreasonably dangerous.

All right. What's "unreasonably dangerous," you're thinking. It just means more dangerous than it needs to be to get the job done. Okay? A knife has to have a sharp edge to get the job done. So the dangerous part of a knife is the only way a knife can exist. If it's not sharp, it's a butter knife. But if you want a steak knife, it's got to be sharp. So there's the danger, but the benefit of that danger exceeds the risk. So a knife is not unreasonably dangerous. Right?

A forklift does not have to keep moving when the operator's not in the operator position to do its job of lifting up, carrying, and putting back down, nor does it need to have an open wheel that's unguarded so if you fall out, that wheel can run you over, to do its job of lifting, carrying, and putting down.

Now people may say, "Well, there's a benefit to the one pedal. You can -- you can do the hokey pokey with your left foot." You have to decide whether that benefit exceeds the risk, not having a pedal under that foot. The rest of the industries decided that's not a good idea.

And then they say, "Well, there's a benefit to not having a guard over the rear wheel. It makes it easier to inspect." Well, you can look over the guard; you can look under the guard. They may say, "Well, it's difficult to change the wheels." You don't change the tires very often, but when you do, you unbolt the guard.

So I showed you this a minute ago with only the right-foot pedal. And we have to decide whether that presents an unreasonable danger, a danger that exceeds the benefit.

Again, the danger of a knife's sharp edge exceeds the benefit.

But how do we know if the choice of one pedal with nothing under the left foot creates an unreasonable and unnecessary danger? The Raymond Corporation's going to say that safety should be first. But did the Raymond Corporation follow this rule or simply give it lip service?

Here's what the evidence will show. The Raymond Corporation's reason for not having a pedal under the left foot that would shut this forklift down if the operator fell out, regardless of the reason they're out, is for comfort. They say, "Well, it might limit your ability to move your foot around."

The other companies are selling plenty of forklifts that way.

They don't advertise it as the safest. Their marketing

materials talk about comfort. Their sales brochures talk about

comfort, not safety.

We're going to help you understand another tool. So we've looked at -- the first tool that I asked you to bring is common sense. The second tool that I wanted you to think about is that B56 mandatory standard. The third tool that we're going to learn about is something called the Design Safety Hierarchy. Now this is used by engineers all over the world. And what happens is -- and by the way, the Raymond engineers believe that this is a good tool to use too. They'll tell us that. But do they follow it? When a danger is discovered, this rule requires the designer, the manufacturer, to first try to see if we can get rid of that danger. Can we design the forklift so that the danger just doesn't exist anymore?

The second thing you do is, because that's always going to be the most effective, is that's what the little arrow says, most effective is just get rid of the danger. The ultimate "get rid of danger of forklifts" is you automate everything. That's not possible, so getting rid of the danger is tough. Second thing you do is you can put a guard there. Variety of ways that you can guard the danger.

Here, the danger is that the operator will fall out while it's moving. And what can we do to eliminate that?

Well, we conduce it with design by having the two pedals, but we can eliminate the design -- the wheel being part of that risk by simply putting a guard over it. Again, it doesn't matter why the operator comes out. These changes, additional pedal and a guard, would protect everybody.

Let me be clear. The Raymond Corporation's design allows nearly 9,000-pound forklifts, the weight of two F150 pickup trucks, to keep moving, even when the operator is not safely in the machine. There's no reason for it to do so.

Let me also be clear. The Raymond Corporation's response to the danger is not actions. It's words. What it says is, "We told you in our owner's manual to stay in the forklift. We put a sticker right there on the forklift that says, 'Stay in the forklift.' It's on you. You should have followed our direction. Doesn't matter why you got out.

Doesn't matter if it was completely not your fault. We told you not to fall out. It's on you." Well, looking at this Design Safety Hierarchy, this tool that's used by engineers all over the world, words are your last choice.

So let's go back to the rear of the forklift.

Because the Raymond Corporation chose not to use a left-foot deadman pedal that would have stopped the forklift from moving if the operator was out of the position, out of the operator position, this choice created a danger that's somewhat unique to Raymond's forklifts. All the other forklifts -- everybody has

an open rear wheel, but the other companies have the brake so it makes it exceedingly unlikely that that wheel will run you over. Raymond doesn't. So if they didn't do the design change, that meant they had to do the guard, and the guard is pretty simple. You just put a piece of metal over the leading edge of the wheel and it can't eat people's feet anymore. It will be for you to decide if relying on warning stickers and videos and owner's manuals is the right way to go.

So is it an unreasonable danger? Forklift keeps moving after the operator is out. Is that danger greater than the benefit? That's the evidence you're going to have to look for. Can Raymond show you that that danger is worth having, because there's some benefit it brings? There's no guard over the wheel to prevent it from crushing an operator's foot, and Raymond needs to bring you an excuse for that too.

So once we decide that the forklift is unreasonably dangerous, either because it doesn't stop when you leave the operator position or because the wheel is not guarded or both, once we decide the danger is not necessary, what do we do next? Okay. Next we have to decide if it's more likely true than not that these design choices caused us to be here in this courtroom, from the lack of a brake pedal or the lack of a guard over the wheel or any combination thereof, caused the injuries that we're here about.

Well, to do that, we need to go back in time.

I'm going to take you back in time to July the 29th of 2017. We're in a huge FedEx Supply warehouse, over 2 million square feet. When we look around, we'll actually see a poster of Lidy Anderson on the wall because she is the face of the safety program at FedEx, the poster woman. We also see a bunch of these Raymond Corporation forklifts like the one I've been talking about: One pedal, unguarded wheels.

Now it's an older warehouse. It's in Effingham. It's an older warehouse. It's got cracks in the floor, divots where concrete is broken up. Not like huge -- not like a hole that you would trip in, but when you're riding it, 9,000-pound or 8- to 10,000-pound forklift with a hard rubber tire, these things are jarring.

Now no one is saying FedEx did anything out of the ordinary or wrong. Not a single expert has blamed this on FedEx. I haven't seen Raymond say it's FedEx's fault. No one has said it's FedEx's fault. In fact, Raymond knows that its forklifts will be driven over expansion joints and pieces of pallets and cracks and divots in the floor. That's just life in warehouses. They're not perfect places. And it knows as a result of that, or it should, that people's feet will shake and that they will make movements of their feet when they're moving around with just little movements, just to stay vertical.

Indeed when we look at the forklifts being used in the warehouse, back in July of 2017, we see that the

operators are constantly reacting to the floor by subconsciously moving their feet for comfort and balance. These are not volitional movements. You don't think about, "Oh, you know, I think I'd be more comfortable if my foot was a half-inch to the left. I think I'd be -- I need -- I'm going to look back towards my right. Or I'm going to look this way. I think I probably ought to move my feet before I do so." We don't think about those things. They just happen as part of our effort to stay standing on a moving machine.

It's about 12:45 in the afternoon, a little after lunch back there in Effingham on the 29th of July of 2017 on a Saturday. We see Lidy Anderson getting directions from her team leader Rechel Boone. She goes up to Rechel's office. She goes up there with her forklift. As one of the hardest workers at FedEx, the poster child, if you will, for being a good worker, she's up for the work. But she says, you know, "I think I'll be better if I got a new battery first."

So we see her driving from Ms. Boone's office to get a new battery. As we look, we see a path that she takes. We see Ms. -- my cursor doesn't go there. We see to the left, we see that Ms. Boone's office, and then we see this little thing. It looks like a plug for an extension cord, but that's the forklift path. When this was made, the warehouse had been cleaned out. All the shelving had been sold. FedEx had moved to a new place, and so this is kind of computer-generated stuff.

But on the day of the event, we do have a view down the aisle. This was the aisle that Ms. Anderson chose because the adjacent aisles had pedestrians in them, workers who were picking product. And one thing you know when you're a good forklift operator is you don't want to be near people. Why be near people when you can go around them? And that's what she did and that's consistent with the rules.

But she hit some cracks as she entered this aisle. You can see some of them on the floor, expansion joints and cracks. And it just shook her a little bit. And she says the next thing you know, she lost her balance. And when she lost her balance, she ended up falling out and the wheel gets her left foot.

Now this is the path that she took, and she hits these cracks and loses her balance and falls out. But what we need to keep in mind as we consider the evidence is that if she had been on one of those machines that complied with B56.1, one of those machines that has common sense, one of those machines that puts safety first, it would have proceeded, she still might have lost her balance, but the difference is, when she fell out, it would have stopped and it wouldn't have run over her.

So one of the first people on the scene is Rechel Boone. We're going to hear from Ms. Boone. She was

Ms. Anderson's team leader. As Lidy, who is what she's known by to all her friends, as she lies on the floor in this growing

puddle of blood, Lidy tells her she slipped off and the forklift would not stop. That makes perfect sense. Right? Because if the left foot goes off, the right foot can't come off the brake and you're making it worse. It can't stop until something bad happens. And that's indeed exactly what happens. "Slipped off" means she lost her balance.

Now despite this, the Raymond Corporation will try to convince you in the next few minutes and over the next several days that Ms. Anderson loses control while driving down this relatively straight aisle, that this woman with ten years of experience operating this forklift just loses control on a turn that she's done 10,000 times, and that instead of applying the emergency brake or plugging that would have stopped the forklift, she simply decides to step off the forklift in the middle of an aisle for no apparent reason so it can run her over. Raymond Corporation will want you to ignore her expertise as a forklift operator, ignore the cracks, ignore the fact that operators at the facility complain about how the cracks at the facility jostle them, ignore the fact that while she was on the ground, she said she lost her balance, ignore the fact that its forklift design allows it to keep moving after she fell off.

It will even show you a video. It will show you a video of a forklift taking the same path, a path that you'll see is not challenging to the operator in the video, who's not even close to as skilled as Lidy Anderson. I mean, she had mad

skills. And what you need to ask yourself, and use your common sense, is the forklift the same? Did it hit the cracks? Did he know what was happening?

But that's its only argument. Its only argument to distract us from its design decisions is that this is Lidy's fault, because it must be. She didn't follow the rules. She didn't follow the training. She didn't follow the sticker. She knew the rules. She knew the training. She knew the sticker. And she knew that she would never ever get off a moving forklift so that it could run her over. You'll have to decide if that makes sense.

We're going to meet Lidy Anderson and her husband Jeff. Now Lidy's from the Philippines. She met her first love there and they came back home to Southern Illinois to live happily ever after. It didn't work out that way. He died at a young age from a heart attack, leaving her a widow.

But happily for Jeff Anderson, his mother was a matchmaker. Said, "Jeff, I got a girl you need to meet." Jeff said, "I don't want any girls. I just finished a bad marriage. I'm finished with the girl business." And she said, "This is a good woman." And he said, "Really good woman?" His mom says, "She's a good woman." So he says he'll take her on a date. They go on a date, they fell in love, and they married 18 years ago.

They lived a really amazing life, sort of the

American dream of hard work. They both worked all the time.

Lidy worked all the time. And she worked all the time because they loved adventure. They would go back home to the Philippines. And it was an adventure. They would ride motor cycles. It was an adventure. They had horses. It was just this life of adventure. And they had this amazing young man, Luke, who's turned into a pretty decent basketball player, I'm told. I don't know about that, but he's been raised right. You'll see.

Well, Lidy's life changed when the Raymond Corporation's forklift ran over her because she lost her balance. She hit some cracks. Her foot moved a couple inches to the left. Not intentionally. Just because people's feet move when we bump into things. And she fell out. And then the unguarded wheel ran her over and chewed the skin off her leg from the ankle down, like removing an athletic sock.

She's not done well. We're not going to be hearing about one of these amazing people who get an amputation and they get great prosthetics and they go on to be in the Olympics. We're going to hear about somebody who it hurts to put her prosthetic on. We're going to hear about somebody who has phantom pain, that is, they feel as if their foot was still there and it won't go away. We're going to hear about somebody who basically lives in a wheelchair. She's 54 and she's going to be a different person with different needs for the rest of

her life. Her past medical bills alone are \$870,776.

Now we're going to bring a witness to you named Jan Klosterman who's a certified nurse life care planner. And what Ms. Klosterman's going to help us understand is that living with this kind of injury requires money. As she ages, she's going to need health care. She needs home adjustment. She needs prosthetics. She needs therapy. She needs all of these things and it costs money. And Ms. Klosterman has made it her life goal as an adult to help people figure out how to do that, how to come up with that money, to live the best life possible.

The cost for Lidy's life care plan, just to keep her in legs and assistance, is \$3,014,062. And we'll bring all this to you later. Because she's unable to work, we're going to learn that the value of her lost wages is \$973,248. But these numbers don't include physical pain, mental pain, disfigurement, posttraumatic stress disorder, loss of society, companionship, marital relations.

And I want to share with you a little bit about Jeff. Jeff has terminal cancer. He has had some rough goes of it. We're doing good today. But Lidy could not take care of Jeff when he needed her most. And when he will need her even more, I pray to God that it doesn't happen, but when he needs her even more, she won't be able to give him the support that that 18-year investment in their marriage warranted, that she wants to be able to do, and that he deserves. And that's one of

the damages we're going to be talking about.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now before I end my discussion with you, I've got to tell you that we're going to hear from a variety of expert witnesses. When you consider their testimony, compare them to your common sense. I'm going to bring you Dr. John Meyer. He's a mechanical engineer. He's going to help us understand how the Raymond 4250 compares with the standards, with the Design Safety Hierarchy, with the rest of the injury, and just good engineering. And he's going to help us understand how if this forklift had been designed consistent with the way the rest of the industry does it, we would not be here.

We're going to meet a fellow named Professor John Jeka from the University of Delaware. He's one of the world's leaders on balance. I think you're going to find this really It's really fascinating, because we all think we know about balance because we learn in seventh grade how our inner ear works. It's not that way at all. It's an automatic response that's modulated by our spinal cord. And we move our feet sometimes and we don't have any idea they're moving. tell us things like, raise your right arm. What's the first muscle that fires? It's not your shoulder. It's in your legs, because if it wasn't in your legs, you'd tip over. Nobody knows He's going to help us understand that, because it explains how Lidy's foot got out. That's not carelessness by It just happens because humans move that way as part of her.

our balance system. Now it's just an automatic response to an ever-changing world and ever-changing riding.

We're also going to hear from Professor Jason
Kerrigan. Dr. Kerrigan teaches both biomechanical engineering
and he teaches at the medical school at University of Virginia
to help people understand biomechanical issues. And
Dr. Kerrigan's going to help us understand how Ms. Anderson fell
out of the forklift and why a wheel guard would have made a
difference. In other words, if there had been a wheel guard,
the injuries would be either none or substantially less.

One last thing about these experts, Dr. Meyer,
Dr. Jeka, Dr. Kerrigan, they're also going to help us understand
why the opinions offered by the experts brought by the Raymond
Corporation just don't make sense. Look at their video, ask, Is
that the same age forklift? Does it ride the same? Are the
hours on the forklift the same? In other words, are the mileage
the same? Is the path the same that Lidy took?

Well, at the end of the evidence, we're going to ask you to put the cost of Raymond, the Raymond Corporation's choices, the cost of what the Raymond Corporation took away from this family, from Lidy and from Jeff Anderson, on the Raymond Corporation, and not on Lidy and Jeff and their family. And we will ask for your verdict in the amount of \$14 million. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. It is 20 minutes after 2.

I anticipate the opening statement of Defendant will take a little time so we're going to take our first break. This break, folks, we will show you to the jury room. There are snacks in there. If you look in the refrigerator, there's various chocolates and other goodies that are there for your use.

So I'm going to read you an instruction, though.

I won't read it every time we take a break, but I am required to
do it regularly. And here it goes.

We are about to take our first break during the trial. I want to remind you of the instruction I gave you earlier. Until the trial is over, you're not to discuss this case with anyone, including your fellow jurors, members of your family, people involved in the trial, or anyone else.

You may not communicate with anyone about this case using your cell phone or through e-mail, a Blackberry, an iPhone, text messaging, or Twitter. Certainly you're not supposed to go through any blog or website, Facebook or any internet chat room, other social media, Instagram, Snapchat, LinkedIn, or YouTube.

If anyone approaches you and tries to talk to you about the case, do not tell your fellow jurors but advise me about it immediately. And also, do not read or listen to any news reports of the trial.

Finally, remember to keep an open mind until all the evidence has been received and you have heard the views of

your fellow jurors.

While I may not repeat this instruction at every break, it is important that you keep it in mind throughout the trial. We are in recess until 2:30.

(Jury exits at 2:19 p.m.)

(Recess from 2:19 p.m. to 2:31 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Let the record reflect that we're back on the record. The jury is still in the jury room and Counsel for Raymond wanted to present something to the Court.

MR. LoCOCO: Thank you, Your Honor.

We talked Friday about opening statements and the use of exhibits during opening statement and showing each other what we intended to use. When we came in this morning, I asked Mr. Warshauer what he intended to use, and I had up all the slides I intended to use, which I showed to him. I just added one, which I showed to him. He showed me about six pieces of paper, which I knew would be shown --

THE COURT: Could you hold on a second? People are running in and out of this door. I don't know what's going on. Is there something going on?

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Well --

THE COURT: We're going to have something --

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Go ahead.

THE COURT: We've got a hearing going on on the

record. When this is over, then we'll alert the jury. We'll bring them out. Okay?

MR. LoCOCO: And so I asked Mr. Warshauer to show me what he intended to use. He showed me about six pieces of paper, most of which were photographs. I saw no video. I saw no, you know, PowerPoint with arrows moving and I saw nothing about the Safety Design Hierarchy. And I -- we prepared a motion to warn the Court, because I've been in trials with Mr. Warshauer before. And we decided on our team, it's a new day, we didn't want to start off on the wrong foot. And I probably wouldn't have objected to what was used.

My objection, Your Honor, is that we had a clear directive from you Friday. I in good faith showed Mr. Warshauer everything I intend to use to show to the jury, and he did not return the favor. And I hate that we have to put everything on the record, but we'll have no choice but to keep doing that if Mr. Warshauer isn't -- doesn't comply with instructions and, you know, the niceties and the decorum that you require.

I was left with -- there was one I wanted to object to, but then I'm interrupting his opening statement, which as you know, Your Honor, given your experience, no lawyer wants to do that to another lawyer. So I'm not asking for any relief at this point. It's a -- it's something on the pile, though, that concerns me, since we're at the start of the trial. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Warshauer?

MR. WARSHAUER: I'm not even sure it merits a response, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It does merit a response. If -wait. If in fact you made representations to your opponent
that, "Here are the things I'm going to show the jury," and you
did not -- and you did not share with him things that you
actually did show the jury, that merits a response.

MR. WARSHAUER: That would if that was true.

THE COURT: Because it invites a response from

me.

MR. WARSHAUER: That would be true.

THE COURT: All right. So go ahead.

MR. WARSHAUER: But the reason I said it doesn't merit a response is because it is not true. The video, I showed him the still from the video. I said, "This is from your video called 'Safety on the Move.'" There was no -- nothing surprising about that. The Design Hierarchy, the response -- the agreement was we would show each other evidence. That triangle doesn't go out with the jury. It's just a demonstrative thing that we draw. It's not part of what we're doing. The logos aren't evidence either. They're part of my argument. I didn't show him unreasonable danger. I said, "I'm not showing you the words. I'm showing you things that are evidence that if you have a problem with these going out --"

Similarly, he showed me things that are evidence. I had no expectation nor do I believe I've seen anything he has that are words or surely demonstrative. We talked about his evidentiary things and we did that before lunch. I said, "I don't agree with all of them." And the Court said, "Well, you don't have to make the objection during the closing -- opening," which I -- is fine. But I showed him the things that were evidentiary, the things that had numbers, that have a potential for coming in. I absolutely stuck with what I understood to be our agreement.

THE COURT: Except this. If -- suppose you put something up there that you said, "Well, this is not going to be evidentiary, because I know the judge would never allow it in to begin with," that's problematic. When lawyers tell me that they've met and they've discussed things and they've shared what they're going to share, I take them at their word. I'm fourth-generation trial lawyer. That's the way I was raised. It's the way I practice law. I don't like having to micromanage trials, particularly one that's going to last this long. But I'm also very sensitive to the problems with springing surprises on opponents during the middle of trial.

MR. WARSHAUER: There was no --

THE COURT: And particularly when there's a gentlemen's agreement ahead of time. We're not going to be doing those things.

MR. WARSHAUER: I showed him all the evidence. That's what I understood would be our agreement.

MR. LoCOCO: Your Honor --

MR. WARSHAUER: I would never show anyone something like my list of unreasonable danger. That wouldn't -- I'm not showing the whole thing. I never understood "Show the entire slideshow." It was "Show things that are evidentiary so that we can object beforehand."

THE COURT: I think going forward, you should presume that if we have an understanding that you're going to show something to the jury, that you have to show the other side first. It works both ways. "I'm going to show this picture."

So you've made your record. You've responded --

MR. LoCOCO: Well, I didn't lie, Your Honor, about what I said happened this morning. And Mr. Warshauer has now admitted that he didn't show me everything he was going to put up in front of the jury. That was my understanding. And I guess I used the wrong words. Shame on me. That's not how lawyers are supposed to deal with each other. And Mr. Warshauer's a smart guy. This is the third time he's done this to me, and it's going to be the last.

MR. WARSHAUER: You know what? It's not the third time. Quit inventing things, Mr. LoCoco.

MR. LoCOCO: Young, Dezoete. You were admonished in Dezoete over it.

That's not true. 1 MR. WARSHAUER: The reality, 2 Your Honor, is I genuinely believed it was limited to evidence. I've never ever in my life shown every slide that I would show. 3 If that's what I should have understood, I apologize. If that's 4 what I should have understood, I will make sure that that is 5 what I understand as we move forward. I'd --6 7 THE COURT: Well, a slide that just shows your argument that ticks off, you know, "It's unreasonable for one, 8 9 two, and three," I could understand that. But the videos and 10 photos and logos, those are all things --11 MR. WARSHAUER: I did show all the photos. video still, I said, "This is from your 'Safety on the Move.'" 12 I told him that. 13 He didn't say he was going to show 14 MR. LoCOCO: 15 the video, Your Honor, and he didn't show me the logos. So I'm fine. 16 17 MR. WARSHAUER: I intentionally didn't show the I didn't think they were evidence. That was my 18 19 understanding. I won't do it again. 20 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 21 MR. LoCOCO: Thank you. 22 THE COURT: Let's bring the jury in. 23 (Jury enters at 2:39 p.m.) 24 THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone, thank 25 you.

We're now at that part of the proceeding with Defendant's opening statement.

Counsel, please proceed.

MR. LoCOCO: Thank you. Thank you, Your Honor.

May it please this Honorable Court,

Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Anderson, Counsel. May it please you, members of the jury.

As you know from this morning, my name is Frank LoCoco. And along with Pat Murphy and Margaret Heitkamp, we're proud to be here representing the people at Raymond in Greene, New York, who are today working on the design, manufacture, and sales of lift trucks like the one you see in the photograph here that are useful and safe for society.

Thank you very much for all of your service. We know it's an inconvenience. I was listening to Mr. Warshauer's opening statement, and I've never used this reference or metaphor in an opening statement, but it seemed apt. I think we all missed it now, but there used to be a newscaster up in Chicago. He broadcast out of Chicago, but he was national. Paul Harvey. And he was famous for "the rest of the story."

And there's always the rest of the story, and what I'm going to try to do for -- through this opening statement is explain to you the rest of the story, why this product was designed the way it is, why it has an open back, why

it has a deadman pedal, the fact that it's over 8,000 pounds, and nothing that weighs that much stops on a dime. I'm going to explain to you how Raymond went about designing the truck as opposed to what you'll hear in the evidence about how Mr. Warshauer's plaintiff expert witnesses criticized this truck. There's a whole design process that you're going to hear about.

I'm going to explain to you that we didn't hear -- you know, when a lawsuit is brought, it takes a year or two to come to this point. We're at trial. The lawyers ask for things from each other's witnesses and each other's parties, depositions are taken where people sit down and they're sworn under oath and you take testimony, we got medical records, we got the FedEx Supply Chain investigation materials,

Ms. Anderson's training documents. She was trained very well and she was a good worker, but the evidence is going to show she made a mistake this day. So we got that.

We got the medical records. We got statements that were given, including by Rechel Boone, who's supposed to testify. I think our first witness. And there is not one piece of paper that we came across that said anything about losing balance. The first time we heard "losing balance" in this case is when I sat down virtually, because of the pandemic, with Mrs. Anderson. She was in her home in Effingham. I was in my office in Milwaukee. And she testified -- I got it further down

in my notes, but I want to read it to you now. She testified, "I was driving in my forklift. I ran over some crack. My forklift was shaking and I lost my balance. The next thing I knew, I was on the ground and the forklift ran over my leg."

A few pages later in the transcript, I tried to follow up. "Do you recall how you came out of the compartment?" Answer: "It was shaking in my forklift. The next thing I knew, I was on the floor and it ran over my leg." That time, she didn't say "balance." There's no piece of paper, no medical record, no statement from a witness saying that Ms. Anderson lost her balance. We heard that after the lawyers got involved and after the lawsuit got filed.

And I'm going to come back to the issue of balance, because this compartment that we see in this photograph here was designed to make the operator comfortable and safe and secure. And you're going to hear about that during the trial.

So why are you here? Why did we need you to be here? Because you need to decide this case. And this case, this trial, and ultimately your deliberations are about one thing: Who or what is responsible for the accident and serious injury suffered by Mrs. Anderson back on July 29, 2017. We will prove to you through the witnesses who testify and the exhibits that you see that this accident, these injuries, were caused not by the design of this lift truck, but by the conduct of Mrs. Anderson herself, her failure to take care of her own

safety, her failure to follow the training, warnings, and instructions she was provided. If she had done that, we wouldn't be here today.

Mrs. Anderson was taught to stay within the protective confines of the operator's compartment, and we'll show that during normal operation of the forklift, there's no reason to leave the safe confines of the operator's compartment. And Mrs. Anderson sustained a serious injury because she left the compartment while it was still moving, while it was moving toward a potential collision with that post that we see in this photograph.

This photograph was taken a few months after the accident, but this shows how the forklift was situated at the time Mrs. Anderson was found by Ms. Boone. As Mr. Warshauer told you, she was found in this area. She's only a foot or two from a collision with that vertical post. And the evidence that we bring to you is going to show that instead of just staying in the compartment, where she would have been safe even in a collision, or lifting her right foot to stop the forklift, she got out and tried to get away, and that's why she got caught by that steer wheel.

And you're going to see a lot of scientific evidence that explains that to you, kind of like CSI, working with the medical records and the injuries and working backwards with this geometry to figure out actually what happened, because

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there were no eyewitnesses and Mrs. Anderson's memory is not great about what happened, other than what I read to you.

So this forklift is loaded with design features that are intended to keep not just Mrs. Anderson safe but any operator of a lift truck like this. It's over 4 tons.

Mrs. Anderson will tell you, she knew that it could hurt her badly if she got out of the truck while it was still operating, while it was still moving.

If Mrs. Anderson -- and this is what the evidence is aging to show. If she had followed her training, used her right foot to stop the truck, because she testified that she used her right foot on that deadman pedal -- just to be clear, the deadman pedal -- let me get to a better picture. So this is the deadman pedal down there. Now the way it works is backwards of a car. You don't push on it to brake the lift truck. order for the -- it's an electric truck. It's powered by a 36-volt battery. In order to power the truck, you have to push your foot down on the pedal. Before you do that, though, you turn a key. There's three microprocessor computers at least on this truck. It does a self-test to make sure everything's working, then you put your foot down on the pedal to energize the truck and make sure it can work. And this handle is used, the travel lever, to go forwards and backwards, and this steer tiller is used to go left or right, to turn. And that's how the truck is used.

So if Ms. Anderson had just picked up her right foot, two things would have been true: One, the truck would have stopped. But it doesn't stop on a dime. It's 8,000 pounds. From full speed, this truck will stop -- which is about 8 miles an hour. This truck will stop in about 10 feet. The other thing that happens, if you're standing the way Mr. Warshauer described -- so I'm in that compartment the way you see it. You pick up your right foot. What happens then? Your left foot has the weight of your body. You're holding on to these handles. Your back's against the back pad. You can't get out of the forklift because you weighted your left foot. All your weight's on your left foot, so you can't stick your left foot out.

Now even though we don't have the burden of proof on the design issues, as I said, we're going to explain to you why this forklift is free of defects. We heard about two that they're claiming this forklift had back at the time of this incident. Mr. Warshauer mentioned Dr. Meyer and Dr. Kerrigan. Well, when I took their depositions last year, they had at least four theories, so I guess we're down to two now.

In any event, this truck was designed as a safety system to minimize the overall risk to operators, no matter what the hazard is. So there's a hazard of a collision, obviously. Right? Whoops. Let me get rid of this. Went the wrong way. So that's a collision hazard. Raymond designs for that. These

trucks also lift things very high and so the trucks can tip over, and they're used on loading docks so they can also go off a dock if other safety rules aren't followed. And so the operator -- that compartment has to have an open back. That open back has to be there so that an operator, in the event of a tip-over or an off-the-dock, can get away from the danger of the tip-over quickly and easily.

The flip side is, the compartment is designed so that if you're about to have a collision, you get away from the danger by getting yourself further into the compartment. And the evidence is going to show that in addition to this pedal -- which if you take your right foot off of it, your left foot is weighted so it can't go outside. Also, you're going to learn that this left-side hip bolster keeps -- is just enough of an edge to help you keep nestled in that compartment.

You're going to learn that the floor down here is tipped. So if you're looking at the back of it like we are, it's tipped from left to right and from the back of the forklift to the front in order to keep you in that corner furthest away to give you stability and comfort and safety. All of that was designed into this compartment to help the operator stay in.

There's a slip-resistant floor mat there. These handles that we talked about are substantial for keeping the operator firm. And then we of course have the back pad.

We are also going to prove to you -- so we're

going to prove to you that this design the way it is minimizes the risk for all users. We're going to also prove to you that this pedal design that Mr. Warshauer spoke with you about is extremely safe and flexible for the operator. You put two pedals down and force the operator to stand on two pedals for eight hours, they get no posture relief. So it will be important to listen to the other side's experts on how they took that into account, which they didn't, because they haven't designed anything.

Mr. Warshauer says if they had just done what Crown did, left-foot deadman pedal -- these same expert witnesses, who I expect you'll hear from in this case, Dr. Meyer and Dr. Jeka, were in a courtroom in Florida less than one month ago criticizing Crown for having a left-foot deadman pedal. Dr. Jeka likes the right-foot deadman pedal. But we're here now against Raymond, so the evidence you'll hear from Dr. Jeka and Dr. Meyer here is that they should have the Crown pedal, not the Raymond pedal. Well, this is the Raymond case.

We will also show to you through the evidence that even if there had been a left-foot deadman pedal, even if there had been a left-foot deadman pedal, we'd still be here. The truck did stop. The truck did stop. It didn't collide. And Mrs. Anderson doesn't remember how her left foot came out. She doesn't remember the details of how it got under the left -- under the steer tire. And that left-foot deadman pedal that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Warshauer's talking about would only matter if the truck had stopped before it hit the left foot. And we're going to have evidence to prove that even if the pedal had been under the left foot instead of the right foot, she would have still been injured, which brings up an important concept.

Part of your work in this case is to determine whether the defect claims they make, if fixed, would it have made any difference in the outcome here? Lawyers call that I guess normal people call it causation too. be like saying that the Raymond lift truck is defective because Well, the defect of redness only matters if it would it's red. have prevented -- if it had something to do with Mrs. Anderson's Same with the second deadman pedal. Same with the accident. quard over the steer tire. We're going to have scientific evidence here to show you that it would have made no difference What would have made a difference is Mrs. Anderson whatsoever. following her training and instructions, staying in that safe compartment.

This case is very simple, but designing a piece of equipment like this is complex, and you can't do it on the back of a napkin. One of the things you're going to -- one of the witnesses we intend to have here is a man named Bob Kerila. Mr. Kerila is a mechanical engineer at the Raymond Corporation. He's been there for 25 or 30 years. He will take you through the steps of the design process that Raymond uses. I've got up

on the screen now -- it's a little small to see. We'll blow it up during the trial.

But Raymond has a seven-step process from Phase 0 to Phase VI. It includes a concept, feasibility, planning and specification, design, develop, and test, document, release and launch, production, program audit, review. It's a lengthy process. It's got hundreds of steps. And Dr. Meyer, who's here to tell you about these two defect allegations that he's come up with, the left-foot deadman pedal and the guard over the steer tire, he'll tell you that he's only gotten to the concept phase. He hasn't done any of these other steps in the design process, but he'll be here tomorrow or the next day criticizing Raymond's design.

So I want to kind of dig in a little bit more into each of those three areas: What happened during the accident, how this truck was designed, and why it's designed the way it is.

Let me tell you a few things about Raymond.

Raymond is a company that was founded by a man named George

Raymond almost a hundred years ago. It had been ongoing for

about 45 years prior to that, but then it was only making

agricultural implements. It's in upstate New York, in Greene,

New York, which is about an hour and a half southeast of

Syracuse, about three hours west of New York City. It's in the

Finger Lakes region. They also have a plant in Muscatine, Iowa.

And over the years, Raymond has become a major manufacturer of lift trucks. Currently, they have about 1,500 employees total, about 1,100 in Green, New York, 400 in Muscatine. These people design, manufacture, sell, market lift trucks. If I said this, I apologize, but they have about 200 degreed engineers of all sorts of types: Software engineers, mechanical engineers, electrical engineers. It's an electric truck. And those engineers spend their time designing and testing to make sure that the truck is safe for people to use like Mrs. Anderson.

As I said, the open back is a conscious safety feature. It's a required safety feature. Mr. Warshauer showed you the B56.1. This is the ANSI Standard. This is the standard that Raymond has to comply with when it sells a truck to an employer, and you'll see a few sections. Mr. Warshauer already showed you this 20.2, which says you have to have a traction cutoff if the operator leaves the operator's station.

Well, first of all, a traction cutoff is not a brake. Put that aside for a second. All that means is when you get out of the truck, it shouldn't -- the traction should cut off, which this truck does. If you look at the operator's manual, when you get out of the -- and we'll do this. When you get out of the truck, you come to a stop, you take your foot off the deadman pedal, that sets the parking brake, you turn off the key, and then you get out of the truck.

In any event, a couple other sections. There's a Section 7.41, which has this note on it. "Stand-ups, rear entry, end control, narrow aisle, and reach trucks shall be designed with open operator compartments to permit easy ingress and egress. This allows the operator where possible a free and easy egress from the truck in the event of an imminent tip-over or off-the-dock accident."

This standard, the B56.1, is called a balance standard. Only one-third of the seats on it are held by manufacturers. Another one-third are by users. Another one-third are by people who are interested in being on the standard writing committee.

Mr. Warshauer's expert witnesses, Dr. Meyer and Dr. Jeka, they could be on that committee if they petitioned to be on it. They could write recommendations for the standard. They haven't done that.

In any event, it's a balance committee. It includes someone who represents the UAW, all the auto workers. It includes a representative from OSHA whose only task is operator safety.

There's another section -- whoops, let me get rid of this. In the section for users, it says "A dock tip-over can occur if a truck is steered over the edge or driven off a dock or ramp. They can also occur if a highway truck or trailer rolls away from the truck -- from the dock or is driven away.

"(e) These trucks are designed with open operator compartments to permit easy ingress and egress. Although there's no sure way in all circumstances to avoid injury, where possible, in the event of an imminent tip-over or off-the-dock accident, the operator should step off and away from the truck. These actions are intended to reduce the risk of serious injury or death. For non-tip-over accidents, such as imminent collision with other objects in the work environment, the operator should utilize protection provided by the compartment by staying within its confines."

So right there in that snippet of the standard, you hear about collisions and you hear about off-the-docks and tip-overs. Now there's other safety features on the truck that really aren't relevant here. There's an overhead guard to protect the operator if stuff falls off from up on other shelves. Doesn't really have anything to do with this case.

The battery, by the way, is here. It's a 36-volt battery, I think. Anyway, it weighs over a ton, just the battery.

That's the front page of the operator's manual that goes with the forklift. This is the top section of the warning decal that's on the forklift. "When stopping, stay inside the compartment until truck comes to a complete stop --complete halt. Keep all portions of the body inside the operator's compartment."

This compartment is designed to accommodate the 5th percentile male -- female, up to the 95th percentile female, so someone who's small in stature. Mrs. Anderson, who was about 5'3" at the time of the accident and 170 pounds, something like that, it accommodates someone her size. It also accommodates -- I don't know if my weight fits it, but it accommodates somebody up to 6' or 6'2" and 2-something. So it's made to accommodate a number of different sized individuals.

This one's a little hard to see here, but we'll have some other pictures that show these armrest areas. There's three levels of arm rests because it's there to accommodate different sizes of operators.

This forklift, the 4250 -- this is not true on most other forklifts. The 4250, though, had something that Raymond calls the floating floor. These trucks -- Mr. Warshauer said they're hard rubber tires, they're not inflated, and there's no suspension like you have in a car, so there's -- there can be obvious road shock. But this truck has a floating floor, and that's -- that means it's got a dampener to take on going over cracks in the warehouse floor. The truck is designed to accommodate that.

Also what you'll hear is that Raymond does not put a product out in the field until it's gone through thousands and thousands of hours of testing and evaluation. I'll just give you one example. The 4250, this issue of balance,

Mr. Kerila will tell you that they have -- they have people at Raymond called night riders. They come in second and third shift, and all they do is drive prototypes around the factory, around the test lab, at Raymond, and even over something called a bump track, which has bumps and ridges and -- to mimic going over a rough floor. And the operators keep notes, they report problems, and Raymond designs based on the feedback they're getting. Mr. Kerila will explain that to you.

We intend to have three -- we told you about Mr. Kerila. We intend to have three other experts testify. We're not going to call all of them. As you already heard, we don't have to put any evidence on. But they're Dr. Timothy Rhoades, Dr. Kate Rodowicz, and Mr. Michael Rogers.

Dr. Rhoades is a renowned human factors expert witness. He is -- he was a professor for a long time at University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. Raymond's engineering department went out and had him look at the operator's compartment and the right-foot pedal. And he did testing involving Raymond trucks, Raymond operators, millions of pieces of data, to determine how operators use the truck, and he'll explain his research to you.

And he'll tell you that his research showed that people use the back pad, that people do move their feet around in the compartment, and that gives them good posture relief.

And that during all the testing he did, no one ever fell out or

lost their balance. Mrs. Anderson had been operating in this facility for three or four years. She had never fallen out or lost her balance.

You'll hear about some other things that Raymond sends along with the truck: A DVD entitled "Principles of Safe Operation." I expect you'll see that. Training is incredibly important. You can't just get on this truck. It's not a toaster or a blender. So you'll hear about that.

You'll hear that operators are trained to stay away from the danger. If there's a collision, you get in the compartment. If you're going off the dock or tipping over, you get out of the compartment.

Mr. Kerila will explain to you how safety is a part of every bit of their design effort within the engineering department. They test component parts, they make prototypes for use in the lab, then they do field testing out in the field. And they get feedback and they refine the design, and only then does it get ready to be put into the facility -- into the market.

You'll also learn that no product, let alone a lift truck that weighs 8,000 pounds, is accident-proof. So the evidence is going to show that this design, though, is there to protect operators, including Mrs. Anderson. She had the protection she needed.

Dr. Rodowicz and Mr. Rogers -- Mr. Rogers is a

mechanical engineer. He has -- he's a member of the B56.1 committee. He's on the committee that writes that standard. He'll tell you that this design complies with even 20.2, Mr. Warshauer's section. He's a mechanical engineer. He's been working on forklift issues for 30 years, over 30 years.

Dr. Rodowicz is a biomechanical engineer. She's from a company called Exponent, which has like 700 engineers and multiple offices. She's got her Ph.D. in biomechanics, which is the study of biology, people, and engineering principles. I'm going to come back to her in a second.

Mr. Rogers is with a company called Fusion
Engineering, located in Naperville, Illinois, which most of you know is a little west of Chicago.

We talked about the open back, why the truck has an open back. Well, part of the analysis that Mr. Rogers and Dr. Rodowicz did for Raymond was, well, what happens if somebody does stay in the compartment and doesn't get away? Well, they can be seriously injured. And so they did -- to learn about that, they did some off -- what we call off-the-dock testing. This is the same style of truck that was involved in Mrs. Anderson's accident. I'm going to just play it through. There's an anthropomorphic test dummy on the truck, an ATD.

(Video played.)

MR. LoCOCO: Here's the same test, but this is from the back and it's in slow motion. The ATD is instrumented

in the head, the neck, the chest, the pelvis. The head has chalk on it so you can see if it hits anything. It's going to hit the edge of the dock here. And so it's work like this that supports the standard and frankly Raymond's decision to have an open back.

Okay. So Raymond designed the truck, though, so that you can use either foot, left foot or right foot.

Mrs. Anderson was a right-foot operator, so you'll learn about that. And that's perfectly fine. And like I said, if you pick your right foot up off the deadman pedal, your left foot can't get out.

Now I mentioned that the plaintiff's expert witnesses, Dr. Meyer and Dr. Jeka, Dr. Meyer in particular, because he's the engineer, they've not designed a pedal configuration for this Raymond truck. I guess they're just going to rely on Crown in this case. They've not designed a guard for over the steer tire. And as I said to you earlier, they've done no testing. They've done no design work. They've done no testing. They've done no analysis. There's no science that they're going to bring to you that will prove that either of their fixes would have made a difference here.

Mr. Warshauer said, "Put a guard over the steer tire." Well, one of the things that Dr. Rodowicz did is she did what's called a circuit study in her work in this case. She went and got a model, approximately the same height and weight

as Mrs. Anderson, put on the exact same style of shoe that Mrs. Anderson was wearing. And this is just one of the pictures that Dr. Rodowicz took. And what this shows is that even if this steer tire had been guarded with a guard right to the level of the rest of the frame, Mrs. Anderson's foot still gets into the tire. We're still here. Besides the fact that you'll learn, that this is an 8,000-pound vehicle. Getting hit by an 8,000-pound vehicle, even at 2 miles an hour, is going to hurt. It's going to hurt you.

On the deadman pedal, as I said earlier, there's no evidence that they're going to show you that the timing would have made any difference, because -- and they also don't know Mrs. Anderson's speed at the time. They don't know when she came out. They don't know when her right foot came up off the deadman pedal, which of course would have braked the truck. And the truck did brake. It stopped. It didn't collide with that post. The evidence is going to show she got out before she should have.

All right. I want to talk a little bit about the plaintiff's accident. A few things we haven't talked about yet. I told you that first time we heard about loss of balance was Mrs. Anderson's deposition. You were told about Rechel Boone. You were told that Mrs. Anderson told Ms. Boone, "I slipped off and it would not stop." I wrote it down in my notes. The reason I wrote it down in my notes is, Ms. Boone gave a written

statement right after the accident on the same day. That's not reported in there, that Ms. Anderson said anything like that.

Mr. McCoy took a telephone statement from

Ms. Boone months after the accident. She doesn't say anything

like that in the statement. Mr. Warshauer apparently had lunch

with Ms. Boone about a month ago, and today we hear "slipped off

and would not stop." I don't know if we'll hear that from

Ms. Boone, but that's what we heard today. And even "slipped

off and did not stop" is not "I lost my balance."

Mrs. Anderson doesn't -- can't tell you how her feet came out of the compartment. She can't tell you how her left foot got caught by the steer tire. She couldn't remember her speed. She couldn't remember her actions in getting out of the compartment.

And I mentioned Dr. Jeka. Dr. Jeka's theory is that Mrs. Anderson was -- now I'm coming toward you in the forklift. She was coming down this aisle, making that S-turn, down the aisle. And for some reason, her automatic balance system got triggered, even if she didn't know it. So she went to broaden her base of support and when she did that, oops, there's no platform there, and she fell out. Mrs. Anderson never had that happen to her before. There's no evidence that that's what happened. And if that's what would have happened, the evidence is going to show, she wouldn't have been hit by the tire. She would have been hit by the frame, this far over.

So this is a video that was taken by Mr. Rogers and Dr. Rodowicz. They took an exemplar down to this facility. As Mr. Warshauer said, all the racks were cleared out. And he drove the path over the same cracks --

(Video played.)

MR. LoCOCO: -- at various speeds. What else did they do? Because scientifically, Mr. Rogers and Dr. Rodowicz were trying to figure out what happened. Ms. Anderson had limited information. She'd been through a trauma, a terrible trauma. There's no dispute about that. And so what do you have? You have the truck, you have the geometry, you have the medical records. So Dr. Rodowicz worked backwards from the medical records and figured out that the only way for Mrs. Anderson to have gotten hurt is to have gotten her left foot in between these two steer tires that are at the back.

So you see there's -- it's a dual steer tire.

And the evidence is going to show that Mrs. Anderson's injuries occurred because her foot got between those two tires. In fact, I expect Ms. Boone is going to testify that when she came on the scene and they had to move the truck, they pulled

Mrs. Anderson's shoe, not her foot, but her shoe out from between those steer tires. And we've got a model of the steer tires so you can see that. So they had that information.

And Dr. Rodowicz went further in her analysis -it's the last slide here -- and determined that this is what

happened. The truck was moving counterclockwise toward the vertical post, and Mrs. Anderson was trying to move clockwise away from the compartment. She came out, over, and down with her left foot, and that's how it got caught. Even Dr. Kerrigan, Mr. Warshauer's biomechanical engineer, will tell you that she got caught by the steer tires in basically this condition, facing the back of the forklift, not just a step down. So all the scientific evidence -- I know it sounds a little complicated now, but it's not -- it's pieces of a puzzle that are going to be put together by Dr. Rodowicz and Mr. Rogers.

So we've got today these two claims of a left-foot deadman pedal and a guard over the steer tire. Hasn't been designed, hasn't been tested, and there's no analysis on this issue of causation that it would have made any difference. And that is important -- that's an important part of the proof, because if it wouldn't have made a difference, it's irrelevant, even if it was a defect, which we believe we'll show you neither of these were.

None of these claimed defects had anything to do with this accident or Mrs. Anderson's injuries. Now I'm almost done. I have just a few additional things to say before I sit down, and we hear -- start hearing evidence.

I spent a lot of time talking about the model 4250, the design process at Raymond, the analysis that's been done in this case, and the safe design of this lift truck. We

disagree with the plaintiff, as you can tell, about a lot of, a lot of things. But there's one thing we don't disagree on, and that's that Mrs. Anderson was seriously injured. This was a bad accident. It was a really bad accident. And I don't know the Andersons very well. I met them a couple of times. But they're nice people. This was just a bad thing that happened. And it's not because of the design in the truck. But it's a bad injury.

Our focus is on the first part of the case, the issue of defect. Now that doesn't mean that we're going to agree with everything that the plaintiffs put in front of you regarding the amount of the damages. We don't, and we'll cross-examine those witnesses. But we do agree that she sustained serious injuries here.

A couple of other general points before I sit down. First is a reminder to keep an open mind. Don't make up your mind until you've heard all the evidence. I've never had a Court -- I've never heard that story, it was the last question from the last witness. Absolutely true. Wait until you've heard all the evidence before you make up your mind.

We go second in the case always. And as you see in closing argument, the plaintiff gets to go on rebuttal again. Even on the evidence, the plaintiff gets to go on rebuttal. But they have the burden of proof. And the burden of proof is a burden of proof. The law calls it a burden for a reason. They have the burden to prove the defects, one or the other, and that

the alleged defects actually caused Mrs. Anderson's injury.

Third point is to say something about common sense. The Court addressed this. Mr. Warshauer addressed this. This is my pitch. Common sense is the most important thing you've got going for you as jurors. You didn't leave it down in the parking lot or out on the street. You didn't check it at the door to Judge McGlynn's courtroom. It's very important in this case. Where is the proof? You know the old commercial, "Where's the beef?"

I said at the beginning of this opening statement that this trial and your deliberations are about one thing: Who or what is responsible for Mrs. Anderson's terrible injuries that she sustained back on July 29th, 2017? The evidence will show overwhelmingly that Mrs. Anderson's injuries were caused by her own conduct, not by the design of this lift truck. The design of this lift truck was there to protect her if she would have let it. All she had to do was follow her training.

Mrs. Anderson is responsible for her injuries, and that will be the proof in this case. And that's why at the end of the case, we'll be here at the end of the case, we'll be asking you for a verdict in Raymond's favor. Thank you.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. It's 3:25.
We have one witness. Would Counsel approach the bench?

(Sidebar begins.)

THE COURT: How long do we think she's going to 1 2 take? 3 MR. WARSHAUER: 25 minutes of direct. MR. LoCOCO: Yeah, so we won't finish her today. 4 5 MR. WARSHAUER: I don't think so. Or bring her back in the morning, but. 6 7 THE COURT: Yeah. That's been brought to my 8 attention, that we have a juror that's -- lives a fair distance 9 away in Salem, and he's concerned that he --10 MR. WARSHAUER: Salem. 11 THE COURT: He says, "I ain't got money for a I ain't got gas money." So we're going to have to take 12 hotel. 13 that up. MR. LoCOCO: I think we should start in the 14 morning, personally. She'll be a pretty quick witness. 15 MR. WARSHAUER: I don't mind. 16 17 MR. LoCOCO: He says 25 minutes. It's not going to be 25 minutes. 18 19 THE COURT: Well, it's -- well, but then how long 20 is your cross-examination? 21 MR. LoCOCO: Depends on how much he gets out, but 22 10, 15, 20 minutes. MR. MURPHY: We've got a motion to make 23 beforehand. 24 25 MR. LoCOCO: And we've got an argument we've got

to make on her.

THE COURT: All right. Well, what I'm going to do then is I'll announce to the jury that we have some matters to take up that will try to help streamline the case, so I'm going to let them go today and have them come back tomorrow, 9, with the hopes that we start at 9:15. And we'll start fresh tomorrow.

MR. MURPHY: Sounds good.

THE COURT: Any problem with that?

MR. LoCOCO: No. Thank you.

(Sidebar ends.)

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, you started today earlier than we normally start. I think they had you here by 8 a.m. And we have a witness that I think will probably take about an hour. But my -- I try to get people out by 4 o'clock, and if I -- if I err, I'm going to err on letting you out a little earlier than letting you out later.

So we will -- there's some other matters that the lawyers and I have to take up today, and so we thought that we would let you guys go for today. We'll finish some of the matters that we have to take up so it will take a while anyway, and so I'd rather take them up this afternoon while you guys are on your way home than have you waiting in the jury room cooling your heels while we take it up in the morning, so.

So we are in recess for five minutes. Make it

ten minutes. But the jury will be released for the day. Folks, 1 2 I'd like you back here at 9 a.m., by 9 a.m. They're meeting in the jury room here, not the 3 jury assembly room; is that correct? So instead of starting off 4 downstairs, you're going to come in here and we'll have you 5 waiting in the jury room before we -- until we start. All 6 7 right? We are in recess for five minutes. And Juror Number -- Juror Number 5, I 8 9 would like to discuss a matter with you before you leave. 10 Not a problem. All right. We are in recess. 11 (Jury exits at 3:27 p.m.) 12 (Sidebar begins.) 13 THE COURT: All right. It's been brought to my attention you have some concerns about the financial impact of 14 coming to trial for the next week and few days may have on you. 15 16 Are you concerned about not having money for a hotel room and 17 not having money for gas? Is that correct? 18 JUROR NO. 5: True. 19 THE COURT: In a nutshell? 20 JUROR NO. 5: Yes. 21 THE COURT: What do you do for a living? 22 JUROR NO. 5: I work at a tire center in Salem, Salem Tire. 23 24 THE COURT: Who runs that? 25 JUROR NO. 5: Glenn Hernandez. I actually work

Just kind of like his little to-do guy. 1 for him. 2 THE COURT: All right. The -- do you have any thoughts? Do they have a fund here or anything to help? 3 MR. MURPHY: I think the district court fund -- I 4 dipped into that thing incessantly. 5 THE COURT: We have a district court fund, and 6 7 why don't you -- I've been to Salem a lot of times, I know --8 there's just not -- not a guick way to get from there to East 9 Saint Louis. But why don't you -- when you drive home tonight, 10 make a note on your mileage, and we'll get something for you to 11 get that addressed. 12 JUROR NO. 5: I appreciate that. Thank you. 13 THE COURT: All right? 14 JUROR NO. 5: Thank you. THE COURT: Any other concerns? If we have that 15 16 taken care of, are you good to go? JUROR NO. 5: Yeah. As long as I got gas to get 17 back and forth, that's fine, or stay here during the week. 18 19 Something -- you know, gas is fine. I can drive. It's no big 20 deal. 21 THE COURT: Okay. All right. We will address it 22 So just when you come back, let me know your mileage. 23 What's gas going for in Salem now? 24 JUROR NO. 5: Probably like 3.20-something a 25 gallon.

THE COURT: If you fill up a tank, you do one of 1 2 two things. I don't know where you are now. If you could see 3 what the -- what it takes to get here, if it's a half tank a 4 quarter tank or whatever, and... 5 JUROR NO. 5: Okay. 6 THE COURT: And if you have a receipt, I can look 7 at it that way. All right? 8 JUROR NO. 5: All right. 9 THE COURT: Because the miles -- the cents per 10 mile I think was set when gas was, you know, a dollar-50 ago, 11 But we'll get you taken care of. SO. 12 JUROR NO. 5: Thank you. THE COURT: All right? Anything for the record? 13 MR. LoCOCO: No, Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: Thank you. Head out. 16 (Sidebar ends.) (Discussion off the record.) 17 18 THE COURT: We are on the record in Anderson v. 19 I have excused the jury and the jury is -- they're not 20 out of the building. They're out of the immediate area of the 21 courtroom. 22 Did Defendants have a motion that they wanted to 23 present? 24 MR. MURPHY: I do. 25 THE COURT: All right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MURPHY: And, Your Honor, I'm going to speak right here so the court reporter can hear me. I don't have on a mike.

You have heard the opening statements and we have been presented with what the plaintiff expects Mrs. Boone to say. And before she testifies, irrespective of what she has stated in her written statement that we all have, her description of what happened to her, to Mrs. Boone, is the classic description of hearsay under Federal Rule 801. doesn't matter that she's here and that she can be cross-examined. And by that, I mean the plaintiff can be cross-examined, what she said to Mrs. Boone, her statement describing the accident, if she says that. Now in her statement, she says she doesn't know anything about that, but she can come here, change her mind. That's hearsay under Federal Rule 801. It's an out of court statement offered to prove the very thing that was said what happened to her. "I was flipped out or flipped off the lift." It's hearsay, Judge. 801. In the motion --

THE COURT: Not an excited utterance?

MR. MURPHY: It's not. It doesn't come within that -- I think the excited utterance is what, 803(3)?

LAW CLERK: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: And it's not a present sense impression. It's already happened.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MURPHY: It doesn't come with any exception is what I'm saying.

THE COURT: Mr. Warshauer?

MR. WARSHAUER: I think the statement that you make at the time of the event while it is absolutely ongoing couldn't be more classic excited utterance exception to the rule against hearsay.

THE COURT: Rule 803 is exceptions to rule against hearsay, regardless of whether the declarant is available as a witness. Present sense impressions: Statements describing or explaining an event or condition made while perceiving the event or immediately afterwards. Or an excited utterance, which is (2): Statement relating to a startling event or condition made while the declarant is under the stress of excitement that it caused. There's also then existing mental, emotional, or physical conditions.

I do not have the value of having the statement of this witness, having previously read it. I'm going to deny the motion now because if it is as I understand, statements that may have been made contemporaneous to this incident happening, they could come in under 803(1) as a present sense impression or 803(2) as an excited utterance.

Is there -- is this before she's taken away from the hospital?

MR. WARSHAUER: Indeed. It is while she is lying there, probably within under three minutes of the event. I mean, it's pretty -- pretty ripe. I do have something I would like to take up also.

MR. MURPHY: I'm not finished yet on this.

THE COURT: Right. Go ahead.

MR. MURPHY: Now the other problem we have is Mr. McCoy took a written statement, and it's going to be inconsistent with what we were just told. Okay? So that means that he's going to have to be a witness when we impeach this woman. Now that's just something that has to be taken into account.

MR. McCOY: It's a recorded statement.

MR. MURPHY: It's a recorded statement by him.

MR. McCOY: That's transcribed.

MR. MURPHY: That's right.

MR. WARSHAUER: We don't mind. Put him up. He didn't ask her the question. There's no -- you can't use that, "What did you say? You didn't say it in the statement," when you weren't asked the question in the statement. It's never happened.

MR. MURPHY: I'll let the jury and the judge decide that question. But what you just heard today is the first time there's ever a whisper that she was flipped out of this unit.

MR. WARSHAUER: Oh, my gosh. That is absolutely 1 2 not true. Page 67 --3 MR. MURPHY: Judge, I don't --THE COURT: One at a time. Go ahead. 4 MR. MURPHY: I'm a little different on these 5 I'm pretty careful about what I say. It's not there. 6 7 There's none of this getting flipped out of the unit. That's 8 all I'm going to say. Tomorrow we're going to hear what the 9 foundation is. We have the recorded statement. We have the recorded statement. And we'll just have to go from there. But 10 11 you're alerted to it, and that's all I can ask any judge to do. 12 THE COURT: All right. And I'll keep that in 13 mind, and --Judge? 14 MR. WARSHAUER: 15 THE COURT: Did you want to respond? Sure. With all due respect to 16 MR. WARSHAUER: 17 Mr. Murphy, I don't think he's quite as familiar with the record as perhaps other ones are. Indeed, when Mr. Mulvany was deposed 18 19 on June the 25th of 2020 --20 THE COURT: And I don't know who he is. 21 MR. WARSHAUER: Mr. Mulvany was the plant 22 manager, if you will. 23 THE COURT: All right. 24 MR. WARSHAUER: Mr. LoCoco asked him a question 25 at page 67, line 7. Line 6 is where it begins. And he's

pointing to the written report that Mr. Mulvany has created. He says, "All right." I'm quoting Mr. LoCoco. "Sort of in the middle of this box, you write, quote, one of our emergency responders reported that Mrs. Anderson stated that she slipped and that the forklift would not stop." "That's pretty much what I said she said."

The next question is, "Do you recall who this person was?" Answer: "Rechel Boone."

So to say that the first time it's ever existed in the history of the planet was either that I created it or that I first said it here is just not true. The record reflects that "slipped and it wouldn't stop" goes back to the moment of the event, from two sources.

Unless there's more to say on that, Judge, I do have one thing I'd like to do.

THE COURT: Are you guys -- anything more to say?

MR. LoCOCO: We're good.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MURPHY: I mean, that's another hearsay statement. I'm -- that's all I've got to say. I've said what I have to say.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right.

MR. WARSHAUER: Just briefly. And I really -it's not in the form of a motion as much as sort of a reminder
to Counsel, but I do need to put it on the record.

The plaintiffs filed a motion in limine about evidence of due care, and we pointed out how evidence of due care was inappropriate in this strict liability case. We're not four minutes into the opening when they're talking about their design process and how it shows the good care that they went through, these seven steps to design their machine. And it basically proceeded throughout the entire argument about how "we're so careful" and how "the good people at Greene, New York, really care with our 200 engineers." That's not relevant, Judge. And they need to be reminded to stick to the ruling, which was that it shouldn't come in.

MR. LoCOCO: That's not the ruling.

MR. MURPHY: Judge, I've got -- you asked for some authority on that and I brought it.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MURPHY: Illinois Supreme Court answered the question in Jablonski, and it was followed up by the Federal District Court in Kane. I thought you'd probably enjoy reading this this evening. And I checked the appellate court decision. It was overturned from the Fifth District, and you were not on the panel.

THE COURT: I remember Jablonski. You're right.

MR. MURPHY: That's all I have to say about that.

THE COURT: All right. The case is Jablonski v.

Ford Motor Company. It was an Illinois Supreme Court case,

decided September 22nd, 2011. It's citation 2011 IL 110096.

Then there's a -- I've been handed a case out of the Northern District of Illinois, Hakim v. Safariland, LLC.

That's a Northern District -- it's a decision from the Northern District of Illinois. 2019 410 F. Supp. 3d 862. It's a memo. I'm trying to see who the judge was.

MR. LoCOCO: If I could just add one other thing about this.

THE COURT: Let me see if there's a judge that -Thomas Durkin was the trial judge on that one. Yes, sir?

MR. LoCOCO: Yeah. I think Mr. Warshauer's actually misstating the rule a little bit. The pattern instruction says that even if you find that the defendant exercised all due care, what's relevant is the design. So that instruction itself assumes that there's going to be evidence about how the design was -- came about. We've got nothing to say otherwise. Right? So we've got to be able to explain what we did and how we did it.

And of course, it also is in juxtaposition to the shoddy work from their expert witnesses. So it goes to their credibility as well. And I think those two cases Mr. Murphy provided to you also explain that there's not some hammerlike law that says we can't talk about our -- what we did in the context of design.

THE COURT: All right. I will read these cases.

The Jablonski case was unanimous decision. I remember it in the 1 2 Fifth District, but I'll read this tonight. You brought it to my attention. We can take it up tomorrow morning before we 3 bring the jury in. All right? 4 5 So we're going to start with tomorrow the first witness -- is her name Bloom? 6 7 MR. WARSHAUER: Rechel Boone. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Then who do we got next after 9 that? Next will be Dr. Jeka, then --10 MR. WARSHAUER: 11 THE COURT: Do you think that takes us to lunch? 12 MR. WARSHAUER: A little before. 13 THE COURT: All right. And then --MR. WARSHAUER: I'm told by my 14 wife/partner/boss --15 16 THE COURT: I'm sorry? MR. WARSHAUER: I'm told by my wife/partner/boss 17 that I've got to shorten things up. I talk too much. So we 18 19 will be quicker with him than in the past. I trust her. She's 20 smart. 21 THE COURT: All right. And then do we have 22 people online for tomorrow afternoon? 23 MR. WARSHAUER: Yeah, we've got a full day. We 24 have then Dr. Meyer and we have Dr. Kerrigan here. 25 All right. That's a full day. THE COURT:

I just want to confirm that's the 1 MR. LoCOCO: 2 order. MR. WARSHAUER: That is -- it's the order as --3 the order that I know. 4 MR. LoCOCO: That's fine. Because I don't think 5 we're going to -- I don't think we're going to get to Kerrigan. 6 7 It has to do with how late am I going to stay up tonight, so. 8 THE COURT: Well, I -- having thoroughly enjoyed 9 the massive briefing on Daubert motions on this, I would think that Meyer would take an afternoon. 10 11 MR. WARSHAUER: I hope not. THE COURT: Yeah, no, I hope not either, but, I 12 mean, I read the depositions, and that took longer than the 13 afternoon, I can tell you that. 14 MR. WARSHAUER: Keep in mind that over half of 15 16 that was doors. THE COURT: Pardon me? 17 MR. WARSHAUER: Over half of that was doors. 18 19 THE COURT: There's a lot of truth to that. 20 Well, we'll see what we see. All right. 21 Anything else before we go off the record? MR. WARSHAUER: No, sir. 22 23 MR. LoCOCO: No thank you. 24 THE COURT: All right. So tomorrow, please be 25 here by 9 a.m. You can tell jurors to be here at 8:30, but

there's always somebody that's here at 8:45. We've got some jurors that travel quite a distance, so I would be happy if we're able to start in earnest at 9:15. All right. See you all tomorrow. (Recess at 3:50 p.m.) COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Dated this 21st day of December, 2021 /s/ Hannah Jagler Hannah Jagler, RMR, CRR, FCRR Official Court Reporter